REMARKS

Claims 1-21 are pending. By this Amendment, claim 1, 15, 16, 18, and 21 are amended to clarify the recited subject matter. No new matter is added.

Support for the amendments to claims 1 and 15 is found in at least paragraphs [0030] and [0033] of the Specification. Claims 16 and 18 are amended for consistency with claim 15.

For purposes of expedition, claims 1, 15, 16, 18, and 21 has been amended in several particulars for purposes of clarity and brevity that are unrelated to patentability and prior art rejections in accordance with current Office policy and to assist the Examiner to expedite compact prosecution of the instant application. Accordingly, entry of the foregoing amendment is proper under 37 C.F.R. §1.116(b) because the amendment simply responds to the issue raised in the final rejection, no new issues are raised, no further search is required, and the foregoing amendment is believed to remove the basis of the outstanding rejections and to place all claims in condition for allowance.

For the following reasons, reconsideration is respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §112:

On page 2, item 3 of the Office Action, claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as indefinite. Claim 21 is amended to obviate the rejection. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103:

On page 2, item 6 of the Office Action, claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Knight (NPL – "bye-bye box: applet loading secrets", developer, July 9, 1998, pgs 1-4), in view of Renshaw (U.S. Patent 6,065,024). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

It is respectfully submitted that none of Knight, Renshaw, or their combination, disclose or suggest a method of displaying a markup document linked to an applet, the method comprising delaying display of image output information for the markup document using image output delay information used to delay display of the markup document, and included in the applet or the markup document, and synchronizing the delayed image output information for the markup document with applet output information for an applet linked to the markup document,

when rendering of the applet is completed, as recited in claim 1.

Instead of delaying display of image output information for the markup document, Knight loads the web page first, and then loads the java applet. The fact that the web page is loaded first is clear from the statement that "[t]he truth is, we can't get rid of the gray screen completely. But we can try and get rid of it as soon as possible – even before the Applet is entirely loaded" (see, for example, page 3, last paragraph of Knight). Thus, Knight does not delay loading of the web page. Rather, Knight simply loads the web page first, and then simply monitors the progress of the loading image of the applet using a MediaTracker object to determine when the image of the Applet is ready to be shown on the gray screen of the already displayed web page (see, for example, page 2, item 2 of Knight). While the Applet image of knight is loaded and the MediaTracker monitors the progress, something other than the gray screen is displayed (see, for example, page 2, item 3 of Knight), such as a "nifty 'blue screen'" (see, for example, page 3, penultimate paragraph of knight). Thus, a user is distracted while the Applet is loading (see, for example, page 3, last paragraph of Knight). Accordingly, Knight fails to disclose or suggest the recited delay feature.

Renshaw, on the other hand, simply discloses nesting a second HTML document in a reserved area of a first HTML document using a JAVA applet (see, for example, Abstract of Renshaw). Renshaw does not disclose delaying rendering of HTML documents, and instead, discloses that "the steps of rendering a first HTML document may be conducted substantially concurrently with the rendering of the second or an embedded HTML document[,]" using "different threads within a multi-threaded operation system or environment for the execution of the applet performing the rendering and the parsing" (see, for example, col. 9, lines 20-26). In the alternate, Renshaw simply renders the preceding HTML before rendering of a succeeding or embedded HTML document is commenced (see, for example, col. 9, lines 27-30 of Renshaw). Accordingly, Renshaw also fails to disclose or suggest the recited delay feature.

Because of the above, none of Knight, Renshaw, or their combination disclose or suggest each and every feature of claim 1. Accordingly, claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over the applied references and their combination. Claims 2-8, which depend from claim 1, are likewise patentably distinguishable over the applied references and their combination for at least the reasons discussed above, and for the additional features they recite. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

On page 6, item 7 of the Office Action, claims 9-18 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C.

§103(a) as being unpatentable over Renshaw, in view of Knight. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

It is respectfully submitted that none of Renshaw, Knight, or their combination disclose or suggest an information storage medium controlling a computer, comprising a markup document, and an applet linked to the markup document, wherein the applet or the markup document includes markup image output delay information used to delay display of the markup document, as recited in claim 9.

Also, it is respectfully submitted that none of Renshaw, Knight, or their combination disclose or suggest a computer system with a display device, comprising a presentation engine, which interprets a markup document to provide image output information for the markup document and an applet executing engine, which interprets an applet linked to the markup document to provide an applet output, wherein the presentation engine delays display of the image output information for the markup document using image output delay information used to delay display of the markup document, and included in the applet or the markup document, and synchronizes and outputs the delayed image output information of the markup document and the applet output to the display device, when an output control signal indicating completion of rendering of the applet output is input from the applet executing engine, as recited in claim 15.

As discussed above regarding claim 1, none of Renshaw, Knight, or their combination disclose delaying display of image output information for the markup document. A corollary to this fact is that neither Renshaw, nor Knight disclose or suggest markup image output delay information used to delay display of the markup document, as recited in claim 9, or a presentation engine that delays display of the image output information for the markup document, as recited in claim 15.

Accordingly, claims 9 and 15 are patentably distinguishable over the applied references and their combination. Claims 10-14, which depend from claim 9, and claims 16-18, which depend from claim 15, are likewise patentably distinguishable over the applied references and their combination for at least the reasons discussed above and for the additional features they recite. Also, claim 21, which depends from claim 19, is likewise patentably distinguishable over the applied references and their combination for similar reasons. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102:

On page 13, item 9 of the Office Action, claims 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C.

§102(b) as being anticipated by Renshaw. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

It is respectfully submitted that Renshaw fails to disclose or suggest a computer system with a display device, comprising a programmed computer processor controlling synchronous output of a markup document image including a linked applet image to the display device, <u>according to display control information included in the markup document and/or in the applet</u>, so that the markup document image and the linked applet image are displayed simultaneously as a markup image, as recited in claim 19.

In other words, Renshaw does not disclose on what basis "the steps of rendering a first HTML document may be conducted substantially concurrently with the rendering of the second or an embedded HTML document" (see, for example, col. 9, lines 20-23). Renshaw simply states that the rendering steps use "different threads within a multi-threaded operation system or environment for the execution of the applet performing the rendering and the parsing" (see, for example, col. 9, lines 23-26).

In fact, Renshaw discloses that the "rendering by the applet within the respective reserved area of the screen and the actions performed by the applet are <u>independent</u> of the actions performed by the HTML instructions contained within the first HTML document 210" (see for example, col. 4, lines 50-62). The "param" tag which contains URL data to be rendered by the applet simply contains an address or sizes of the data to be rendered (see, for example, col. 4, lines 42-44), but fails to enable a programmed computer processor to control synchronous output of a markup document image including a linked applet image to the display device, as called for in claim 19.

Accordingly, claim 19 is patentably distinguishable over the applied reference. Claim 20, which depends from claim 19, is likewise patentably distinguishable over the applied reference for at least the reason discussed above, and for the additional features it recites. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Based on the foregoing, these rejections are respectfully requested to be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION:

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 503333.

Respectfully submitted,

STEIN, MCEWEN & BUI, LLP

Date: ___1/30/2007___　　　　By: _____

Seth S. Kim
Registration No. 54,577

1400 Eye St., N.W.
Suite 300
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 216-9505
Facsimile: (202) 216-9510